

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4 through 10, 12 and 15 are currently pending in the application.

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of September 9, 2004.

Information Disclosure Statement

Please note that an Information Disclosure Statement was filed herein on August 4, 2003, and that no copies of the second and third sheets of the PTO-1449 were returned with the outstanding Office Action. Applicants respectfully request that the information cited on sheets two and three of the PTO-1449 be made of record herein. For the sake of convenience, a second copy of the August 4, 2003, Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449s (sheets 2 and 3) and copy of USPTO date-stamped postcard are enclosed herewith. It is respectfully requested that initialed copies of the PTO-1449s evidencing consideration of the cited references be returned to the undersigned attorney.

Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2 and 4 of U.S. Patent 6,087,720 in view of U.S. Patent 4,504,435 to Orcutt.

Claim 4 stands rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 6 and 7 of U.S. Patent 6,087,720 in view of U.S. Patent 4,504,435 to Orcutt.

Claims 5 through 10, and 12 through 15 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 8 through 15, and 18 through 20 of U.S. Patent 6,087,720 in view of U.S. Patent 4,504,435 to Orcutt.

In order to avoid further expenses and time delay, Applicants elect to expedite the prosecution of the present application by filing a terminal disclaimer to obviate the double patenting rejections in compliance with 37 CFR §1.321 (b) and (c). Applicants' filing of the terminal disclaimer should not be construed as acquiescence in the Examiner's double patenting

or obviousness-type double patenting rejections. Attached are the terminal disclaimer and accompanying fee.

After carefully considering the cited prior art, the rejections, and the Examiner's comments, Applicants have amended the claimed invention to clearly distinguish over the cited prior art.

Applicants submit that claims 1, 2, 4 through 10, 12 and 15 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicants request the allowance of claims 1, 2, 4 through 10, 12 and 15 and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan
Registration No. 28,393
Attorney for Applicants
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: December 8, 2004
JRD/dlm:dlh

Document in ProLaw